

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed June 23, 2008, the Examiner (a) rejected claims 1-3 and 5-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) and (b) objected to claim 22 as being dependant upon a rejected base claim while indicating that it would be allowable if rewritten in independent format. Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating that claim 22 includes allowable subject matter. Applicants have now amended claims 1, 8, and 15 to recite the allowable subject matter in claim 22. As such, each of claims 1, 8, and 15 now recite that the delay associated with the second delayed, conjugated version of the in-phase and quadrature components of the input signal is approximately one sample interval, which is less than one symbol interval. Applicants have also canceled claim 22 for antecedent basis reasons.

Applicants submit that claims 1, 8, and 15 as written are in condition for allowance. Further, because claims 2-3, 9-14, and 16-21 depend from claims 1, 8, and 15, Applicants submit that claims 2-3, 9-14, and 16-21 are also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully request notice to this effect. The Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' representative below if any questions arise or if he may be of assistance to the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 12, 2008

By: /Rory P. Shea/
Rory P. Shea
Reg. No. 60,529
McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6709
312 913 3337
shea@mbhb.com